

Governor's Forum on Monitoring Salmon Recovery and Watershed Health Summary Minutes

Date: November 29, 2004
Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: Room 172 NRB
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair	Director, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Bill Ruckelshaus, Co-Chair	Chair, Salmon Recovery Funding Board
Terry Wright	Designee, Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Laura Johnson	Director, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Lee Faulconer	Designee, Department of Agriculture
Bruce Crawford,	Program Manager, Office of the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
Dick Wallace	Designee, Department of Ecology
Alan Christensen	Designee, U.S. Forest Service
Brad Ack	Director, Puget Sound Action Team
Ginny Stern	Designee, Department of Health
Mark Clark	Director, Conservation Commission
Tom Karier (by phone)	Designee, Northwest Power and Conservation Council
Kris Petersen	Designee, NOAA Fisheries
Steve Leider	Designee, Governor's Salmon Recovery Office
Bob Nichols	Designee, Governor's Office
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Paul Wagner	Designee, Department of Transportation

Co-chair Jeff Koenings opened the third meeting of the Forum at 9:15 a.m. by having everyone introduce themselves.

The agenda was reviewed and Co-chair Koenings reminded the members that Robert's Rules of Order will be used to guide the meeting format.

Laura Johnson reminded all that the meeting was being filmed live on the local public television station, TVW.

ADOPTION OF CHARTER

Bruce Crawford discussed changes made to the charter due to discussions and comments held at the last meeting.

Brad Ack discussed adding coordination of budgets to the charter. The Forum members believe this is covered in the executive order.

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to approve the proposed charter. Dick Wallace **SECONDED**. Charter **APPROVED** as presented to the membership.

ADOPTION OF VISION STATEMENT

Co-chair Koenings presented the proposed vision statement for adoption. Alan Christensen asked if the coordination of field data collection is included in the vision or just implied. Co-chair Koenings noted that, to the extent possible, every effort will be made to collect and share data.

Co-chair Koenings proposed changing the vision statement to read, “We envision state, federal, local, and tribal governments . . .”

Terry Wright noted that he is okay with how the vision statement reads currently.

Dick Wallace mentioned that, without a seat at the table, local government isn’t included other than by coordination efforts and may not be within scope.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus responded that, with the vision statement, we are saying an envisioned desirable future so he doesn’t see anything wrong with including local governments in the vision statement. He noted that local government might need to be included at the table also.

Co-chair Koenings responded that the Forum might want to include the tribal governments also.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus noted that it would be desirable to have everyone doing the work in coordinating and sharing data.

It was agreed to include “local governments” in the vision statement.

Laura Johnson **MOVED** to adopt the vision statement as amended to include local government. Brad Ack **SECONDED**. Vision statement **APPROVED** as amended to read:

We envision a coordinated network of state, federal, local, and tribal governments able to share data and coordinate spending effectively for developing and reporting the status and trends of Washington’s salmon resources, watershed health, and restoration and recovery actions.

ADOPTION OF FORUM OUTCOMES

Bruce Crawford reminded the Forum members of the outcomes discussion at the October meeting. Outcomes should be the results of the tasks.

Terry Wright would like to include integrated analysis (wanting to coordinate data from state, local, etc. but only integrate state agency data).

Jeff Koenings asked the difference between integration and coordination.

Bruce explained the differences.

Bill Ruckelshaus suggested combining bullets 3 and 4.

Alan Christensen suggested adding integration, collection, and data monitoring.

Laura Johnson is uncomfortable with getting so broad – the vision should be large but uncomfortable with getting so broad.

Dick Wallace would like to provide an opportunity to combine data integration and coordination.

Marnie Tyler, WDFW staff in the audience, discussed the coordination of data sets.

Bob Nichols discussed the need for compatibility of data. Everyone has their own data sets but needs to be compatible with other efforts around the state and region.

Bruce Crawford noted that is what Alan was talking about. Federal Forest information also needs to match with the state information -- both go into different reports but also into their own reports.

Co-chair Koenings responded that what the Executive Order has asked for is large and how to get there is the problem.

Bruce responded that is the reason he had the two separate bullets: one for the integration of state data and one to coordinate data efforts with other partners.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus suggested a short-term and a long-term vision – short-term state efforts only then long-term with everyone involved.

Bob Nichols discussed the need for key indicators standardized for everyone.

Tom Karier suggested adding to the 4th bullet – encourage and promote high levels of regional coordination and integration of data.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus reminded the other members that Laura was concerned about biting off more than we can chew.

Laura responded that for the near term having state efforts better coordinated would be good for everyone and long-term it would be nice to have other efforts coordinated also.

Kris Petersen suggested the following:

- #3 – Coordination of monitoring with state, federal, local and tribal partners
- #4 – Integrated analysis and reporting of state information
- #5 – Encourage and report on coordinated state, federal, local and tribal efforts

Terry Wright believes the group is selling itself short when not including tribal data coordination since in many areas the tribes have the most data.

Co-chair Koenings responded that this all needs to be integrated and that is why he suggested his change to include local and tribal governments including lead entities and RFEGs.

Kris restated her suggestions.

Bob Nichols talked about Tom Karier's suggestion to include the higher level of coordination and integration.

Co-chair Koenings believes that the way Kris presented her suggestion gives that step and implies the higher level.

This suggestion sounds good to Tom Karier.

Bruce suggested adding Alan's statement of collection.

Kris restated her three statements:

#3 – Coordination of monitoring with state, federal, local and tribal partners

#4 – Integrated analysis and reporting of state agency monitoring information

#5 – Encourage and promote report on coordinated state, federal, local and tribal efforts

Alan suggested using bullet #1 as an umbrella statement with the three sub-statements under it, then the current #4 and #5 bullets.

Mark Clark is not sure that required monitoring activities are included in this.

Co-chair Koenings believes it is in the vision statement and probably don't need to include in the outcomes unless the rest of the Forum would like that added.

Terry believes that it is implied.

Brad Ack talked about an integrated plan for the budget for monitoring. This survived the Priorities of Government (POG) process and will come back to this group for action. He would suggest adding this to the outcomes for this group.

Dick agreed with Brad, noting that this was done by the first monitoring group. He would like to not only display appropriate levels of funding as well as displaying the budgets for monitoring and levels needed for watershed health and salmon recovery. May be getting to the wordsmithing of the outcomes statement.

Co-chair Koenings suggested changing bullet #2 to recommend coordinated state spending on monitoring activities.

Ginny Stern suggested adding priorities to the first bullet – convey priorities, results, and progress.

Tom suggested adding design and budgeting to bullet #3 – integrated analysis, design, budgeting, and reporting.

Co-chair Koenings doesn't believe this group wants to start telling state agencies what their budgets are in monitoring efforts.

Brad doesn't believe this is what the POG assignment will be.

Bruce talked about the monitoring efforts and how the Monitoring Oversight Committee (MOC) had a hard time with the prioritization of other state agency's monitoring efforts and this group may have the same problem. Some things may not need to be monitored. If only looking at request level monitoring then it is different than looking at current budgets.

Laura noted that POG didn't always have the full amount of spending on paper. MOC did look at what the state was spending on monitoring efforts around the state. The challenge is how to put the story together for all the efforts.

Co-chair Koenings concurs with Laura that all the information may not have been before the POG group.

Brad believes this does need to be brought to POG since the story needs to be told.

Laura responded that they might need another bullet point on budget for monitoring.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus would like Bruce to tell how much was presented to the Legislature from the MOC. The three questions: what are we doing, what should we be doing, and who should be doing it – need to have those answers for the Legislature.

Dick noted that it may be difficult but this group does need to take the recommendations forward.

Bruce discussed the data pyramid, the highest level of reporting, needs to show connectivity to get funded.

Co-chair Koenings reviewed the bullets:

- Standardized broad measures that convey and prioritize results and progress easily understood by the legislature, congress, and the public.
 - Coordination of monitoring with state, federal, local and tribal partners
 - Integrated analysis and reporting of state agency monitoring information
 - Encourage and promote high level reporting on coordinated state, federal, local and tribal partner efforts
- Recommend coordinated state spending on monitoring activities
- Formal prepared reports on monitoring progress
- Independent Science Panel review of monitoring reports and actions

Bob Nichols **MOVED** to approve the Forum Outcomes as amended. Ginny Stern **SECONDED** the motion.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus reminded the group that this is not written in stone and will change – it is a living document.

Board **APPROVED** the Forum Outcomes statement as amended.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER MEETING

Dick Wallace **MOVED** to approve the minutes as presented. Terry Wright **SECONDED**.

Board Discussion

Co-chair Ruckelshaus had a question about the paragraph on the bottom of page 3 concerning PNAMP. Bruce Crawford explained that is the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership and includes many players and a large area. Although this Forum is a smaller geographic area (state, local, federal) it is at a higher policy level than the PNAMP. Co-chair Koenings reported to co-chair Ruckelshaus that the outcome of the meeting was that Bruce will be representing the Forum at PNAMP. Amend the October minutes to delete last line on page 3 and add Washington.

October minutes **APPROVED** as amended.

ADOPTION OF 2005 MEETING SCHEDULE

Bruce reviewed this agenda item. (See notebook for details.)

Co-chair Koenings reminded everyone that special meetings could be added if needed.

Alan Christensen **MOVED** to approve Resolution #2004-01 as presented. Craig Partridge **SECONDED**. The 2005 Meeting Scheduled **APPROVED**.

RECOMMENDATION FROM SWIMTAC

Joy Paulus presented this agenda item and explained how the SWIMTAC arrived at the recommendations presented. (See notebook item for details.)

Question 1 – Should the Governor's Forum on Monitoring sign the Northwest Environmental Data Network (NED) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)?
SWIMTAC recommendation – Yes

Discussion:

Dick Wallace asked about the scope of the MOU.

Joy reported that it is a broad request for participation but focused on watershed health and salmon recovery. The MOU gives flexibility.

Tom Karier agrees with Joy's answer and likes the staff recommendation.

Joy noted that whether this group decides to sign on as one group or have each agency sign on separately, SWIMTAC suggests someone from the Forum be a representative on NED.

Tom noted that one of the advantages of the Forum is giving one place to present information to the state instead of going to each agency individually.

Decision:

MOTION made by Terry Wright to have Bill Ruckelshaus and Jeff Koenings, as co-chairs, sign on to NED. Tom Karier **SECONDED. APPROVED** by Forum.

Discussed who should be the representative for the Forum on NED. Since this group is at a different level, Bruce does not suggest anyone at this table should be on NED. Terry asked who does sit on the NED. Joy and Bruce told the Forum who is on NED.

It was suggested that Bruce be the representative on NED for the Forum. **APPROVED.**

Brad Ack was concerned that as Forum tasks are prioritized, Bruce may not have time to attend monthly NED meetings.

Bruce responded that he doesn't see his need to attend every meeting but on an as-needed basis with Joy informing him when he is needed.

Question 2 – How does Paladin's technology solution relate to the SWIM Decision Package that was submitted by IAC to OFM?

SWIMTAC recommendation – It doesn't relate to the Natural Resource Information Portal Decision Package. It may support the data management needs of individual organizations.

Discussion:

Bob Nichols saw the Paladin effort as a way to pull the data and display the information. Joy reported that this would be at the local level and the information may or may not be available for the efforts. One is a data collection tool and the other is a data display. Focus of portal decision package is to integrate state data and would be available to the locals.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus is not sure what the Forum is supposed to do with these questions. His understanding is that if the Portal budget package is approved, then Paladin could put in an RFP

Joy reported that there isn't a question for the Forum to answer today but will need to wait until the budget is finalized. If budget for the Portal decision package is approved, then several groups will bring their RFP forward. There are many vendors that can provide this information and have the technology.

Bob Nichols didn't see the Paladin question being asked at the statewide data portal level but as a local tool for data and for local fieldwork.

Bruce reported that the reason the presentations were presented at the last meeting was to provide the Forum with some of the technology options that are available. There are a lot of data collection efforts but the question is whether or not the information is statewide or if it works with state data.

Bob responded that the ability to have the data flow back and forth is key.

That is very important, but Joy hasn't seen that ability in any of the solutions so far. To do that, definitions need to be the same – apples are apples and should not be mixed with oranges.

Alan asked if Joy looked at the federal systems, such as National Water Information System (NWIS).

Joy responded that yes, she has looked at a lot of different systems.

Bob noted that this is for state level data collection and leaves open how locals can collect and use data.

Co-chair Koenings reported that there is a pilot project now on data gathering and standardization efforts.

The discussion of this question helped answer the remaining questions put before the SWIMTAC.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked how the Forum would make sure the SWIMTAC decision package includes the RFP development. Co-chair Koenings wants the RFP brought back to the Forum. Joy reported that the Forum could help SWIMTAC with the cross-agency decisions on consolidated requirements.

Alan discussed the need for discussion on what the RFP should cover. This should be on the April or July meeting agenda.

Co-chair Koenings asked if the SWIMTAC has any Federal representatives.

Joy responded that it has only had a state focus so far. It would be great to get federal support included.

Co-chair Koenings suggested there be a subcommittee to help the SWIMTAC with the development of the RFP.

Terry Wright noted that we will never get to one system that works for everybody – the more SWIMTAC can identify commonalities the more it will help everyone.

Tom would like to have an explanation on how the Washington State portal would coordinate with the regional NED portal.

Joy responded that the nice thing about portals is that they feed each other and that metadata and internet standards has made this possible.

PRIORITIZATION OF BUDGET

Bruce Crawford explained the process used to prioritize the budget. Bruce was only partially successful in this effort. (See notebook for details.)

Bruce reported that there was agreement that only one status and trend proposal should go to OFM for \$1.2 million with additional funding from the SRFB. Still need to develop the final proposal.

Dick Wallace talked about the additional SRFB funding statement and asked how much the budget amount will be since the SRFB will need to know what that proposal will be.

Co-chair Koenings responded that the details still need to be fleshed out with a proposal presented at the February 2005 Forum meeting.

Bruce reviewed the chart on page two of the notebook handout and explained that he put an asterisk on the list of items that were part of the POG, State of Salmon, or comprehensive monitoring strategy to help with the prioritization.

Craig Partridge was sorry he missed the meeting on budget prioritization but the information looks good to him. The only other item is the Forest and Fish monitoring efforts for \$3 million. This needs to be on the list since it was at the top of the Natural Resources POG group's list.

Terry Wright is not sure what is needed from the Forum.

Bruce explained that this is a way to show the new governor the Forum's prioritization of the most important items to the Forum.

Brad Ack has a problem with the Forum reprioritizing the same information that the POG spent so much time prioritizing.

Mark Clark agrees with Brad.

Craig noted that what the POG didn't do was to consolidate the agency priorities into one effort due to time constraints.

Co-chair Koenings noted that the Forum is charged with taking the monitoring efforts statewide and identifying items that are part of each agency's budget. The two main elements that the Forum could speak to is status and trend monitoring efforts and data

portal questions and to get the agencies to work together on this data effort, cross walking with the SRFB on the status and trend monitoring efforts.

Dick Wallace agrees with Co-chair Koenig's recommendation and what is before the Forum. If the POG process continues, a consensus opinion from the Forum will be needed in the future.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus is still trying to figure out what this means to the SRFB. Need to be very clear on what to do with this money.

Laura responded that the request to the SRFB would be \$335,000 for the remainder of this biennium then \$1.2 million would go to OFM for funding and an additional request of \$770 to SRFB for on-going efforts in the next biennium.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus believes that the state should not ask the SRFB for long-term commitment of status and trend monitoring funds. If the Forum thinks status and trend monitoring is important, then the state needs to commit to the efforts.

Discussed whether or not SRFB should provide long-term funding for this effort – is the SRFB the right place for this commitment or does it belong somewhere else?

Terry Wright suggested letting the legislature know that this is a start only and that this group could give more details in the future and that it has started the coordination.

Co-chair Koenings concurred the need to get started and these are the first two points that the Forum can move forward with.

Bruce reported that the State of Salmon report used limiting factor analysis information from two years ago and if the monitoring doesn't get started then there won't be data for the next State of Salmon report.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus asked if the SRFB could wait to decide its support for this effort until the January SRFB meeting.

Dick Wallace reported that, since we won't know the final budget until later in 2005, the SRFB could put off a decision until later or SRFB could approve a set-aside amount with coordination from the Forum.

Laura reported that the SRFB will need to decide how much to put aside for several programs and activities at its December funding meeting.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus discussed the need to look at the monitoring needs for the SRFB.

The decision was made to bring this issue back to the Forum at its February meeting but report to the Legislature that the first priority is status and trend monitoring for \$1.9 million and the second priority is the data portal at \$1.7 million.

Dick asked Bruce to find out when the monitoring folks need to have the decision so not to miss the field season for monitoring.

Bruce will be able to provide that information by the end of the week for the SRFB meeting.

Alan Christensen made a **MOTION** to approve the recommendation. Bill Ruckelshaus **SECONDED** the motion.

Terry Wright is concerned that there are several other items on the list that are important to the tribes.

Brad will abstain from voting since he's not sure where these items fit on the POG process.

Craig responded that he had the list and the items the Forum is talking about are above the line on the POG process.

Brad responded that, if the items are above the line, then he is okay with the recommendation.

Mark said with the portal and other data pieces were dependent on the rest of the budget.

Laura reported that although the POG process is important, she believes that OFM is looking for input from the Governor's Monitoring Forum and that the portal, being a coordinated statewide effort, didn't have one agency to put it forward so if the Forum believes it is important then it should be brought forward.

Co-chair Koenings reported the need to be consistent with the charge to make recommendations on monitoring efforts.

Co-chair Ruckelshaus responded that this is a new group and it hasn't had time to compare with the POG recommendations.

Dick Wallace noted that the amendment to the proposal isn't intended to change the recommendation of POG but is a stand-alone recommendation that may or may not fit with the POG recommendation. This is the statement from the Forum. The next budget cycle will be more useful as the different efforts should be coordinated.

The proposal is to first support status and trend monitoring up to \$1.9 million and then second priority of integration of data across the agencies through the data portal at \$1.7 million – not to revisit the POG process.

APPROVED. Terry Wright abstained from the vote.

Bruce will inform OFM of the Forum's priorities.

PRIORITIZATION OF FORUM TASKS

Will postpone this discussion until the next meeting. Laura Johnson suggested getting a small group together to develop a proposal for the February meeting. Bruce Crawford will use the same subgroup he used for the budget process. Bruce will bring both the prioritization of tasks and the subcommittee set-up recommendation to the next meeting.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Jeff Koenings, Co-Chair

Next meeting: February 2, 2005
 Olympia, Washington